



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/060,909

01/30/2002

Martin Antoni

637.0015USX

9466

7590

02/19/2004

Charles N.J. Ruggiero, Esq.
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
10th Floor
One Landmark Square
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER

SHAFFER, RICKY D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2872

DATE MAILED: 02/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

10/060,909

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKETT NO.
---------------	-------------	-----------------------	----------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MR. JOHN YANKOVICH (3) N/A
(2) R.D. SHAFER (4) _____

Date of Interview 04 FEBRUARY 2004

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description: _____

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached.

Claims discussed: 53

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. PATENT 6,400,794 TO SCHULTZ ET AL

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: DURING A TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW WITH MR. YANKOVICH, THE EXAMINER AND MR. YANKOVICH DISCUSSED IN GREAT DETAIL THE SCHULTZ ET AL ('94) REFERENCE. MR. YANKOVICH ARGUED THAT THE PRIOR ART TO SCHULTZ ET AL ('94) DOES NOT TEACH A FIELD FORMING OPTICAL COMPONENT INCLUDING A GRAZING INCIDENCE MIRROR HAVING A NEGATIVE OPTICAL POWER IN A PATH AFTER SAID GRAZING INCIDENCE MIRROR AND REFERRED THE EXAMINER TO COLUMN 14, LINE 38 TO COLUMN 15, LINE 39 THEREOF. THE EXAMINER STATED THAT IT WOULD APPEAR THAT THE PORTION OF THE SCHULTZ ET AL IN WHICH APPLICANT REFERS WOULD APPEAR TO TEACH AWAY FROM THE LIMITATIONS RELATED IN CLAIM 53. HOWEVER, A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW WOULD BE REQUIRED AND THE EXAMINER WILL REVISIT SUCH ISSUE ONCE AN OFFICIAL RESPONSE IS PROPERLY FILED.
(A full description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☒ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

R.D. Shafer
Examiner's Signature